

6

28071









# THE BENGAL KAYASTHAS

THEIR SASTRIC STATUS AND SOCIAL POSITION  
WITH AUTHORITIES.

BY

SRIRAM CHANDRA BASU.

*PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,*

PASHU PATI GHOSE,

1, UCKOOR DUTT'S LANE,

**Calcutta.**

*Price As. 8*



# THE BENGAL KAYASTHAS.

THEIR SASTRIC STATUS AND SOCIAL POSITION  
WITH AUTHORITIES

BY

SRIRAM CHANDRA BASU.

*PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,*

PASHU PATI GHOSE.

1, UCKOOR DUTT'S LANE,

**Calcutta.**

**1911.**

*Price As. 8*

RMIC LIBRARY

Acc. No. 28071

Class No.

Date

St. Card

Class.

Cat.

Bk. Card

Check

N.R.

R.C.

# INDEX.

---

## A

Aborigines of Bengal 28.

Accountant, assessor, and writer to study Vedas, Vayasa Rishi 14.

—————Dviija, Birmitradya 13.

—————indispensable and responsible officers in  
Raj Darbar, Narad Smriti, Sukranithi,  
Brihaspati Samhita 8, Jagnavalka,  
Garur Puran and Medhatithi 12, 13.

—————indispensable qualifications of ———Maisha  
Puran, Garur Puran, Jagnavalka Samhita,  
and Birmitradya 11, 12, 13.

—————Kayastha, Jagnavalka, Medhatithi, Vishna Samhita,  
Parashar Samhita, Mudrarakhasa, Mrichchakatik  
9, 10, 11.

—————Kshatria, being of the Barna or class of the kings who  
were all Kshatrias at that time, Sukranithi, Med-  
hathi 13, 14.

Adisur King of Bengal 1.

## B

Ballal Sen, divisions of Brahmanas and Kayasthas into Kulin and  
Maulik 35.

Banga Darsana, incorrect conclusion of — 30.

Barnas, division of Hindus into—not by Manu 2.

—————into—by qualifications, Gita and Mahabharat 15, 16.

—————Theory and real meaning of, Cyclopædia of India 26, 46, 47.

Basu, Dasarath, position and qualifications of 23.

Bhattacharjea, J. N. "Hindu casts and sects" by—misstatements  
therein 36, 37.

Brahma, creating power personified 17.

Brahmana, duties of—Vedas and other Sastras 33.

—————not by birth right, Mahabharat and Gita 15, 16.

—————qualified Sudras recognised as—25.

## C

Chandrabansiya—Kshatria 18.

Chitraguptabansiya—Kshatria 18.

## D

- Das. Explanation and meaning of—6, 19, 20.  
 — injunctions against the use of the words—in religious observances by Kayasthas 20.  
 Dasarath Bosu, position and qualifications of—23.

## G

- Gita—classification under four Barnas according to qualifications 15.

## H

- Hindu Castes and Sects by Dr. J. N. Bhattacharjee, misstatements therein 36, 37.

## J

- Jones, Sir William, Incorrect translation of the 6th stanza of the 10th Chapter of Manu and unauthorised introduction of the word Kayastha after Karana 49, 50, 51.

## K

- Karana—higher than Sudra, Jagnavalka, Medhatithi, and Kullaka Bhatta. 49, 50, 51.  
 Kaya—the pure part of the hand at the root of the little finger. 7.  
 Kayastha, Dakshin Rarhi, Uttar Rarhi, Bangaja, and Barendra 35.  
 — Derivation and meaning of—Acharnirnaya Tantra 18.  
 — not Karana, two district castes, Ravrashkosh, a Sanscrit Dictionary, 1, and Jagnavalka 50.  
 — Dvij-Kabi Bhatta Shalevahan 5.  
 — Kshatria, Byoma Samhita 4, Vijnanatantra 7, decision of Civil Court 43. 44.  
 — not Sudra, Manu, Byoma Samhita, Padma Puran 4, 5, 6, and Harit Samhita 17.

## M

- Manu, classification under four Barnas not by—2.  
 — duties of Sudra 4.  
 — incorrect translation of—by Sir William Jones, 49, 50, 51.  
 — Karana higher in caste than Sudra 50.  
 — Kayastha, writer, annotation of Manu by Medhatithi 9.  
 — Time for Upanayana 32.

## P

- Puruhsakta—Chapter of Rigveda, interpolation, Cyclopædia of India by Edward Balfour, L.R.C.S.E. 26.

## INDEX.

iii

### R

- Raghunandana, incomplete quotation from Manu about Sudraism  
of Kayasthas and absurdity of his statement 27, 28.  
Rigveda—interpolated 26, and real meaning of the interpolation 46, 47.

### S

- Sarkar, Shamacharn,—Vyavastha Darpana of—misstatements  
• and fallacious conclusion therein 21, 22.  
Sudra—qualified—recognised as Brahmana 25.  
——Excludes Kayastha Manu, Padma Purana and Harit  
Samhita 4, 6, 17.  
Surjabansiya Kshatria 18.

### U

- Upanyana ——period for— Manu 32.



## PREFACE.

THE Hindus were grouped and classified according to their intellectual and moral qualifications and distinct places or ranks were assigned to them. The people thus comprised under each group were regarded in proportion to those qualifications and attainments in the development of which they were essentially interested for performing the occupations and callings which each had its own. Hindustan having been deprived of its Hindu Sovereignty and ruled for several centuries by foreign nations, the people of the country have consequently become more interested in the languages of their rulers, than in their own which is the proper means of acquiring the knowledge of the early institutions of their societies. The English education and the western civilization have broken down the restraint of caste distinctions and have nearly brought down the whole Hindu nation to a uniform platform of humanity breaking the caste barrier. The people themselves do not know nor even care to know the caste to which they belong according to the classifications in the Hindu Sastras though the present ruling race is rather particular to know about the social institutions of the people it is ruling. Its know-

ledge in Sanskrit in which our Sastras are written being very limited whatever it has come to know of the formation of the institutions is from the English translation or from opinions collected from officials not thoroughly acquainted with it. That knowledge is therefore, incomplete and defective. This anomaly is again complicated by the people themselves ; the children of the soil even those who belong to the higher grades of Hindus do, now-a-days, know very little of the antiquarian interests respecting their own family. They do not know even the names of their forefathers four or five generations back, if they are not alive, unless their pecuniary interests are interfered with. On the other hand they can mention chronologically all the Egyptian and Israelite kings from the earliest period and can trace out the origin of foreign nations and languages. Sons of barbers, washermen and carpenters, have during the British rule received English education and have been carrying on more respectable professions than what their forefathers had followed, and they have no doubt gained some place in the estimation of foreign nations who are not in favour of caste distinction. On the other hand some lower grade of Hindus taking the advantage of this social disturbance want a place in a higher grade. It is these men who, as if, with a vindictive spirit, feel gratified in their aspersions of the Hindu Sastras and of the

higher grades of Hindus. They do not even stop there. They have commenced creating Samhitas giving a convenient account of their own origins and a disrespectful interpretation of caste distinction by which they endeavour to show the fertility of their cultured brain.

It has been my belief since my boyhood that a record in English of the origin of the several Hindu castes as stated in the Hindu Sastras would be interesting, because our rulers wish to know the ethnological history of the people of the country, and as I had an occasion to write a note in English giving an authentic account of the caste to which I belong, in connection with the late Sir Herbert Risley's enquiry, I made the subject my special study.

Basua, Hooghly.

SRIRAM CHANDRA BASU.

## Errata.

PAGE. LINE		for		read
I	19	Manu Sambhita	...	annotation of the Manu samhita
2	18	Kulluka Bhatta	...	Medhatithi
2	19	বর্ণশব্দাঞ্চ তিস্ববু	...	বর্ণশব্দাঞ্চ তিস্ববু
4	4	বর্ণানং	...	বর্ণানং
7	16	তং	...	তং
9	23	শাসনোক্ত	...	শাসনোক্ত
II	9	শ্রেষ্ঠী	...	শ্রেষ্ঠী
II	23	অাদৃগুতম	...	অাদৃগুতম
12	24	কাব্যারিপৌ	...	কাব্যারিপৌ
14	8	ত্রিধ্বংস	...	ত্রিধ্বংস
15	9	শূদ্রানঞ্চ	...	শূদ্রাণাঞ্চ
27	3	লোক	...	লোকে
28	18	<i>proschittha</i>	...	<i>Prayaschitta</i>
29	5	impaertial	...	impartial
30	6	Unarya	...	Anarya
30	17	mineal	...	menial
31	17	<i>Male</i>	...	<i>Mela</i>
37	16	Kulin,	...	Kulin ?
45	9	witness	...	witnesses

# THE BENGAL KAYASTHAS :

## THEIR POSITION IN THE CASTE SYSTEM.

DURING the reign of Adisur in the 10th century of the Christian era, and prior to it there were in Bengal Hindus who called themselves *Brahmanas* and *Karanas*. Those *Brahmanas* are now known as *Saptasali Brahmanas*. The word *Karana* is taken by some to be synonymous with the word *Kayastha*. That is a palpable mistake. *Ravaskosa* রত্নকোষ, an authoritative Dictionary, gives the following eight different meanings of the word *Karana* করণ.

করণং কারণে কায়ে সাধনেদ্রিয়কর্ম্মসু ।

কায়স্থে কচ-বন্ধে না তথা শূদ্রাবিশংস্তুতে ॥

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 1. Cause.    | 5. Action.   |
| 2. Body.     | 6. Kayastha.                                       |
| 3. Devotion. | 7. Binding of hair.                                |
| 4. Organs.   | 8. Offspring of a Sudra mother by a Vaisya-father. |

From the above it appears that a *Karana* can never be called a *Kayastha*.

*Kayasthas* and *Karanas* being two distinct castes, the *Karanas* mentioned in the *Manu Samhita* cannot possibly

be the same caste known as Kayasthas whose ancestors came to the Court of Adisur from Kanouj and afterwards settled in Bengal. I shall deal with the descendants of those Kayasthas and show that they are Kshatrias. My object is not to give the Arya-Kayasthas, as distinguished from Karana-Kayasthas, a new position but to prove their own which is next to that of Brahmanas and which they still occupy in spite of the several modern Samhitas edited at the instance of some specific castes.

The classification of Hindus into four specific groups of Brahmana, Kshatria, Vaisya and Sudra, was not made first by Manu. It had been in existence when his Samhitā was propounded. He was asked by the divine sages

ভগবন্ সৰ্ব্ববৰ্ণানাং যথাবদস্থপূৰ্ণশঃ ।

অস্ত্বরপ্রভবানাঞ্চ ধৰ্ম্মায়ে বক্তুমৰ্হসি ॥

১ম অঃ ২য় শ্লোকঃ ।

Meaning, O esteemed Sire ! Be so pleased as to say what are the religious duties of the different বৰ্ণ Barnas. Kulluka Bhatta in his annotation of the Manu says, বৰ্ণশব্দাক্ তিস্থু ত্রাঙ্গনাদি জাতিসু বৰ্ত্ততে। সৰ্ব্বগ্রহণং শূদ্রাববোধার্থম্ ॥ explaining that by the use of the word বৰ্ণ *Barna* the existence of the orders Brahmana, Kshatria, Vaisya is established, and the use of the word সৰ্ব্ব (all) signifies the inclusion of Sudras in the word বৰ্ণ *Barna*. Therefore, the allegation made that Manu made the four divisions

is not at all maintainable ; consequently, the fourth sloka in the tenth chapter of *Manu* has no reference whatever to the four generic classifications mentioned therein as if they were made by *Manu*. In this chapter, the subject-matter of which is to give an account of the origin of the mixed castes who are the offspring or outcome of the intermarriages between the four specific groups, *Manu* prescribed the religious duties, calling, profession, obligatory functions and also the qualifications of those groups. We would be now justified in finding out from them in which of the groups the different distinctive castes were included. The fourth sloka in the tenth chapter runs as follows :—

ব্রাহ্মণঃ ক্ষত্রিয়ো বৈশ্যঃ শূদ্রো বৈজাতয়ঃ ।

চতুর্থ একজাতিস্ত শূদ্রো নাস্তি তু পঞ্চমঃ ॥

The above sloka goes to show that all the different specific castes grouped under the three heads *Brahmana*, *Kshatria* and *Vaisya*, are called twice-born and are therefore, required to observe the ten *Sanskars* [sacraments] enjoined in the *Hindu Sastras*, while the fourth group, the *Sudra*, includes all the other castes excepting mixed castes (*Barna Sankur*) who are not twice-born, *i.e.*, who are not required to observe the ten *Sanskars*. That the specific caste *Kayastha*, is not included in the fourth group, *Sudra*, will appear from the following

sloka in the Manu-Samhita where the duties of the Sudras are laid down :

একমেব তু শ্রুতং প্রভুঃ কর্তব্যং সমাদিশৎ ।

এতেষামেব বর্ণানং শুশ্রূষ্যনমুয়া ॥

যশু, অঃ ১ শ্লোক ৯১ ।

The injunction is that those of the fourth group Sudra should do service to the other three groups. From the nature and character of the duties which the Kayasthas were required to do at the time when the above injunction was made, every body would be perfectly justified in concluding that the Kayasthas are Dvija or twice-born. Before specifying the duties of the Kayasthas I shall cite other authorities from *Byoma samhita* which will prove at once that the Kayasthas are twice-born and that they are not Sudras.

ব্রহ্মকায়-সমুদ্ভূতঃ কায়স্থো বর্ণ-সংজ্ঞকঃ ।

কলৌ হি ক্ষত্রিয়স্তত্ত্বং পপ যজ্ঞেষু যাজনঃ ॥

This means that Kayastha having sprung from the body of Brahmana is to be known as *Varman* and in the Kali Yuga the caste Kayastha is Kshatria in matters of *Yajna* and religious devotions.

I next give extracts from the introductory letter which was written by Birsing, King of Kanouj, to King Adisur when the former sent ten men in compliance with the request of the latter to perform the *Yajna* which

King Adisur solemnised. The letter will be found in a passage quoted by KABI-BHATTA-SHALIVAHAN (words of কবিভট্টশালিবাহন-স্মৃত-বচনং )

কাণ্ডকুজ-পতির্দাঁরঃ পুরার্থে বিধৃতঃ সূদীঃ ।

বিজ্ঞায় পণ্ডিতাঃ সর্বে আদি ত্যশ্চাভিমুখিতঃ ॥

গৌড়েখরো মহারাজো পুত্রেষ্টিংসমুদ্ভূতঃ ।

তদর্থে প্রেরিতা যজ্ঞে উপযুক্তা দ্বিজা দশ ॥

The word *Dvijadasa* ( দ্বিজা দশ ) with which the quotation ends clearly and conclusively shows that the ten men who came from Kanouj were twice-born. Of the ten men five were Kayasthas, namely, Makaranda Ghose, Dasharatha Basu, Kalidasa Mitra, Birata Guha and Purasattama Datta. They were necessarily Dvija, at least they were regarded at that time as twice-born. Further, that those Kayasthas are Dvija is manifest as it is improbable, that Brahmanas of high degree such as those who came to Adisur from Kanouj would have allowed Sudras in their company and kept any connection with them in the face of the injunction quoted below :—

শূদ্রানং শূদ্রসম্পর্কঃ শূদ্রেণ তু সহাসনং ।

শূদ্র-যজ্ঞাগমশ্চাপি জলং তমপি পাতয়েৎ ॥

—পায়ে, পাতাল-খণ্ডে ।

Meaning that any Brahmana taking rice of Sudra, keeping any connection with him, taking seat with him, taking water from him, or joining his *Yajna*, shall

be fallen [ patita ]. Thus the group Sudra excludes the Kayasthas. Further, it is an undeniable fact that those five Kayasthas came from Kanouj and they were therefore from the stock of the Kayasthas of that place. The present Kayasthas of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh are the descendants of the ancestors of the present Kayasthas of Bengal. The only difference between the two now to be noticed is that those of the former place do wear the sacred thread, whereas those of the latter do not generally take that thread. The absence of that external mark of the Dvija cannot by itself make a 'twice-born once-born. In spite of that want, the present Kayasthas in Bengal are Dvija and also of the original stock of the present Kayasthas in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. It is no where said that the five Kayasthas from Kanouj used the word Das (দাস) before their family title Ghose, Basu, Mitra, Guha and Datta when they came to the Court of Adisur or prior to their emigration to Bengal. In their introduction to the King none of them called himself Das-Ghose or Das-Basu, and the refusal or non-acceptance of that word by the descendants of Purasattama Datta when Ballal Sen made the division of Kayasthas into Kulina and Maulika, is well-known. If their forefathers recognised themselves as দাস "Das" they could not reasonably ignore it. The word *Das* was not in fact

used to indicate that they or their ancestors were menial servants of Brahmanas. It was used to express their submission to the Brahmanas in recognition of the superiority of the Brahmanas who were their spiritual guides and whom they looked upon as living gods. I will revert to this point later on. The assertion made by some that the five Kayasthas who came with the five Brahmanas, were menial servants could not therefore be maintained at all. These Kayasthas were to prepare all the preliminary requirements for the *yagna* which the Brahmanas had to finally perform. \* \*

A further reference to Vijnanatantra (বিজ্ঞান-তন্ত্র) will show that Kayasthas are Kshatriyas and as such they are to perform the ten sanskaras of the twice-born. Brahma, the creator, says :—

নায়া তং চিত্রগুপ্তোহসি মম কায়াদভূয়ত ।  
 তস্মাৎ কায়স্থ বিখ্যাতির্লোকে তব ভবিষ্যতি ॥  
 কায়স্থঃ ক্ষত্রিয়ো বর্ণো ন তু শূদ্রঃ কদাচন ।  
 অতো ভবেৎ সংস্কারা গর্ভাধানাদিকা দশ ॥

এম শ্লোক ।

This sloka means—you have sprung from my body [kaya], your name is Chitra-Gupta, you shall be known as Kayastha—Kshatria Baraa; never Sudra, and therefore you shall have to perform the ten Sanskaras of the twice-born classes.

As some doubt is entertained as to the authenticity of the above sloka, it having been considered an interpolation, I will not stand at all on that authority.

From the quotations given below from different Samhitas and Smritis it will be satisfactorily proved that Kayasthas are Kshatriyas and that from the beginning they have been required to do important duties like the Kshatriyas in connection with the administration of the country or Kingdom.

রাজা সংপুরুষঃ সভ্যাঃ শাস্ত্রং গণক-লেখকৌ ।

হিরণ্যময়িকরকমষ্টাঙ্গঃ সমুদাস্ততঃ ॥

—নারদ-স্মৃতি, ১ম অঃ ।

নৃপোহধিকৃতঃ সভ্যাশ্চ স্মৃতিগণক-লেখকৌ ।

হেঁবাগ্ন্যনু সং পুরুষঃ সাধনান্নানি বৈ দশ ॥

—ভৃকুনীতি (পরিশিষ্ট) ।

বক্তাধ্যক্ষো নৃপঃ শাস্তা সভ্যাঃ কার্য্য-পরীক্ষকঃ ।

স্মৃতি-বিনির্ণয়ং ক্রতে জয়-দানং দমং তথা ।

শপথার্থৌ হিরণ্যায়ী অদু ভূষিত-ক্ষুদ্রয়োঃ ।

গণকৌ গণয়েদর্থং লিখেন্নায়ক লেখকঃ ॥

—বৃহস্পতি-সংহিতা ।

The above extracts from different Hindu Sastras show that the following officers and articles and things are essential in a Court of Justice and in a Rajadarbara. A Judge to examine the plaintiffs, the defendants and the witnesses, A King to pass verdict. Assessors

to watch the proceedings and to explain laws which must be kept at the Court and Rajadarbara and also to interpret the questions of the Judge and the answers thereto given by the plaintiffs, defendants, and witnesses when they could not understand and speak in Sanskrit. Gold and fire for the purpose of administering oaths. Water for the thirsty. A treasurer and accountant in charge of the treasury and a Bench Clerk to write out depositions and decisions. The last two officers were, no doubt, important functionaries in the administration of the country. Now it remains to see who those officers were. The quotation given below will show that they were Kayasthas :

পীড়্যমানাঃ প্রজা রক্ষকং কায়স্থৈশ্চ বিশেষতঃ ।—যাজ্ঞবল্ক্য সংহিতা ।

In the annotation of the above stanza it is explained কায়স্থাঃ গণকাঃ লেখকাশ্চ, *i.e.*, Kayasthas were accountants and writers. The meaning of the main quotation is—Protect the people not simply cultivators but all classes of subjects landlords or tenants, rich or poor, from Kayasthas who are treasurers and accountants not village accountants, and bench clerks. Again *Medhatithi* in his annotation on the passage in the Eighth Chapter of Manu, অষ্টাদশস্ত্র যার্গেবু নিবদ্ধানি পৃথক্ পৃথক্ says :

রাজাগ্রহাৰশাসন্যেককায়স্থ-হস্ত-লিখিতান্যেব প্রমাণী ভবন্তি ।

*Patta* and other deeds of gifts granted by a king and written by Kayasthas only are admissible in

evidence. Thus Kayasthas were authorised and legal writers. It is also said in বিষ্ণুসংহিতা Vishnu Samhita : রাজাধিকরণে তন্নিযুক্ত-কায়স্থ-কৃতং তদধ্যক্ষকর-চিহ্নিতং রাজসাক্ষিক । meaning the deeds which are written by Kayasthas only and which bear the seal of the Chief Judge, are called authenticated deeds. Similar passages are also to be found in পরাশর সংহিতা Parashar Samhita : লেখকানপি কায়স্থান্ লেখ্য-কৃতো বিচক্ষণান্ । Kayasthas who are expert in writing out deeds should be employed by the king as writers and no one else. From all these extracts from different Hindu Sas-  
tras it is manifest that Writers, Accountants and Bench Clerks employed in the Court of Justice and Rajadarbara were Kayasthas. Thus it is proved that Kayasthas were engaged in important branches of the internal administration of the country. This fact will be satisfactorily borne out by a reference to মুদ্রারাক্ষস Mudrarakhasa :

চাণক্য । শীনোত্তরে ! শীনোত্তরে ! যথচনাং কায়স্থমচলদত্তং

অহিষং তদভ্যন্তরপ্রভৃতীনাম্ লেখ্যপত্রং তত্তাবদীয়তামীতি ।

Chanakya said : O Senottara, Senottara ? Tell Achal Datta to make over by my order the documents of Bhadra Bhatta. The readers of Mudrarakhasa know it very well that the whole policy of Chanakya and the stability of the reign of Chandra Gupta depended wholly on those documents. Thus it shows that Achal Datta, who was a Kayastha, was the custodian of

such important documents on which the stability of the reign depended. It is also found from the following passage in the Mrichchakatik that Kayasthas were assessors and interpreters in the Court of Justice :

ততঃ প্রবিশতি শ্রেষ্ঠীকায়স্থাদি পরিবৃতঃ অধিকরণিকঃ ॥

Here the Judge appeared along with the assessors who were Sreshtis and Kayasthas:

Again অধিকরণকঃ । অলং লজ্জয়া ব্যবহারস্তাং পৃচ্ছতি ।

শ্রেষ্ঠী কায়স্থৌ । ব্যবহারো পৃচ্ছদিগম্বিদোষো কথংহি ।

It shows that Sreshtis and Kayasthas interpreted in Prakrit language the questions put by the Judge to the witness who was an old woman and who could not understand Sanskrit.

Now I will give quotations from which it will be seen what were the indispensable qualifications required of Bench Clerks, Treasurers, Accountants and Assessors :

সর্বদেশাঙ্করাভিজ্ঞঃ সর্বশাস্ত্র-বিশারদঃ ।

লেখকঃ কথিতো রাজঃ সর্বাধিকরণেষু বৈ ॥

শীঘ্রোপেতান্ অসম্পূর্ণান্ সমশ্রেণি গতান্ সমান্ ।

অন্তরান্ বৈ লিখেদযন্ত লেখকঃ স বরঃ স্বতঃ ॥

উপায়-বাক্য-কুশলঃ সর্বশাস্ত্র-বিশারদঃ ।

বহুবর্ষবন্ধা চাক্সেন লেখকঃ স্যাস্ত গুপ্তম্ ॥

বক্তৃ ভিপ্রায়তত্ত্বজ্ঞো দেশকালবিভাগবিৎ ॥

অনাসক্তো নুপেতক্তো লেখকঃ স্যাদভ্জগৃহহ । — মৎস্তপুরাণ ১৮৯ অঃ

The meaning is that writers should be versed in different languages, learned in laws and should write a neat and good hand, have presence of mind, express thoughts concisely and clearly, anticipate the intention of the speaker and know the policy of division and be capable of dispensing justice equally between friends and foes and should be loyal.

The Garura Purana says on this point :

মেধাবী বাক্পটুঃ প্রাজ্ঞঃ সত্যবাদী জিতেন্দ্রিয়ঃ ।

সর্বশাস্ত্র সমালোচী হোষ সাধুঃ স লেখকঃ ॥ —গরুড়পুরাণ ১২ অঃ ।

The Bench Clerks or writers in the Court of Justice and Rajadarbara should have the following qualifications : memory, eloquence, wisdom, truthfulness, control over passions and knowledge of the Sastras. Thus it is plain that men only of high order and qualifications could have been Bench Clerks and Treasurers and writers in the Court of Justice and Rajadarbara.

The Jaynavalkya Samhita quoted below gives the qualifications of an assessor and of a member in Council in Rajadarbara, which office was always occupied at that time by Kayasthas only as has already been proved.

ঐতাদ্যয়ন-সম্পন্নঃ ধর্মজ্ঞাঃ সত্যবাদিনঃ ।

রাজা সভাসদঃ কাষ্যা রিপৌ মিত্রেচ যে সযাঃ ॥

It means that those who are accomplished in logic

grammar, and versed in the *Vedas* and are truthful and impartial to friends and foes, should be appointed by the King as assessors and members in his Council. The Kayasthas being such officers were therefore not of the class Sudra and were consequently Dvija, *i.e.*, twice-born, because the Sudras were not then allowed to study the *Vedas*. Again, Mitramisra, in his work *Birmitradya*, says : अत्राध्यायविद्वान्तेगणको द्विजातिः तं सचय्याल्लेखकोऽपि । The fact of studying the Srutis by the accountants and their assistant writers, proves that those officers were twice-born. Further evidence on this point is furnished by Kulluk Bhatta. He, in his annotation of the Manu Samhita, explains that only Brahmanas should be appointed Judges ; as regards other officers in the Court of Justice it is said in सुक्रनीति *Sukraniti*, যোবর্ণজো ভবেদ্রাজ্যযোজ্যস্তদবর্ণজসদা । that all officers in the Court of Justice and Rajadarbara should be taken from the class to which the King himself belongs. At the time when those injunctions were made, all the Kings in the country were Kshatrias. From all these could any body deny with any propriety the fact that treasurers, accountants, bench clerks, writers, assessors and members in Council, who were all Kayasthas, were Kshatrias ?

It is also said in Medhatithi মেধাতিথী :

সন্ধি বিগ্রহকারীত্ব ভবেদবস্তস্যলেখকঃ ।

বয়ং রাজা সমাদিষ্টে স লিখেদ্রাজশাসনম্ ॥

In the above it is enjoined that writers and bench clerks who are capable of ministering peace and waging war should be appointed Secretary to the King who will direct him to write out the decision and verdict. Regarding the indispensable qualifications of the writers in the Court of Justice, *Vayasa Rishi* has said :

ত্রিঋক্জ্যোতিষাভিজ্ঞং ক্ষু টপ্রত্যয় কারকম্ ।

ঐতাব্যয়ন সম্পন্নং গণকং যোজয়েন্নৃপঃ ॥

The meaning is that the King shall appoint those men as accountants who are versed in astrology and the Srutis and who know thoroughly the policy of division. It must be remembered that the Sudras were never allowed to read the Srutis.

Thus the rational and undeniable conclusion would be that writers, accountants and assessors were not of the Sudra but of the twice-born order and the caste to which the king of that ancient time belonged, i.e., Kshatria.

One relying on the গীতা *Gita*, cannot but do away with the theories of birth distinctions by castes and admit that all Hindus at the beginning stood on one and the same platform of common humanity without any distinction. The division in four groups was subsequently made having regard to the natural propensities, qualifications, intellectual developments, acts and conduct of each indivi-

dual man. No man was born a Brahmana, a Kshatria, a Vaisya or a Sudra. Men were classed under those four groups with reference to their merits or demerits and this will be evident from the following :

চাতুৰ্ভৰ্গং যস্যাসৃষ্টং গুণোকৰ্মবিভাগশঃ । গীতা ৪ অ ১৩ শ্লোক ।

meaning, that the four divisions are made having regard to the propensities, qualifications, intellectual culture, acts and pursuits of individuals. It is further said :

ব্রাহ্মণ কত্রিয়বিশাং শূদ্রানঞ্চ পরন্তপ ।

কৰ্ম্মণি প্রবিভক্তানি স্বভাবপ্রভবৈ গুণৈঃ ॥ গীতা ১৮ অ ৪১ শ্লোক ।

The meaning is, O Tormentor of enemies ! men have been enjoined to perform the duties and follow the callings of four generic divisions, namely, Brahmana Kshatria, Vaisya and Sudra, which were made having regard to the natural disposition and intellectual development and ability. Again,

নবিশেষোহস্তি বর্ণানাং সৰ্বং ব্রহ্মময়ং জগৎ ।

ব্রহ্মণাপুৰ্ণং সৃষ্টং হি কৰ্ম্মাণাং বৰ্ণতাং গতঃ ॥ মহাভারত ।

This means that there is no special class distinction. *Brahma*, the creating power, is manifest equally in all visible and perceptible objects in the universe. The class distinctions have subsequently been made having special regard to individual intellectual propensities and develop-

ment exhibited in external manifestations and acts. It is thus proved that in the primitive state of Hindu society there was no caste distinction.

It is said in the *Bhagabat* that whoever possesses the qualifications of the true Brahmana is to be looked upon as such, even if he be Kshatria, a Vaisya or a Sudra, and it is said in *Mahabharata* that descendants of Brahmanas devoid of their qualifications are not Brahmanas.

যস্য যল্লক্ষণং প্রাপ্তং পুংসোবর্ণাভিব্যঞ্জকং ।

যদন্তহাপি দৃশতে তত্তেনৈব বিনির্দেশেৎ ॥

Now I would invite the attention of my readers to the fact, which has been sufficiently proved above, that even in the primitive state of the Hindu society Kayasthas were men of high intellectual attainments and moral development, and ask them to say whether our *Rishis* or Lawgivers could have ever thought of including such highly intellectual men in the lowest grade where the duty assigned is servitude to the different castes included under the three generic heads, specially when the object was to make the divisions according to intellectual qualifications and moral propensities. It should also be considered whether the submission of the Kayasthas to the Brahmanas of ancient days was compulsory under the injunction or voluntary on the Kayasthas' part in recognition of the Brahmanas' higher qualifications and whether

the non-observance of the same injunction in respect of the other two groups, Kshatria and Vaiysa, does not tend to prove non-inclusion of Kayasthas in the group Sudras who are to be guided by that injunction. I quote here what is said in the *Haril-Samhita* হারীত সংহিতা :

গঙ্গা ন হৌয়ং কনকং ন ধাতুত্বং ন দৰ্ভঃ পশবো ন গাবঃ ।

প্রজাপতেঃ কায়স্যুদ্বাবাচ কায়স্থর্ষনী ন ভবন্তি শূদ্রাঃ ॥

The rendering of the above in English is that the water of the sacred river Ganges is not to be regarded as ordinary water but personification of godliness, gold is not to be taken as ordinary metal but personification of *Narayan*, grass, *kush* not ordinary grass but personification of sanctity, cows are not to be taken as beast of burden but personification of goddess, *Bhagabati*, similarly Kayasthas are not to be taken as Sudras but Dvija.

In the Hindu Sastras, *Brahma* is evidently personified as the creating power. That brahmanas have come out from his mouth, the Kayasthas from his body, Kshatrias from his arm, Vaiysas from his thigh and Sudras from his foot, may be interpreted to signify the relative superiority of four organs of action out of five. Body means arm ; thus Kayasthas and Kshatrias have come out from the arm of *Brahma*, the first Diety of the Hindu Triad and the operative creator of the world. In the primitive state of the Hindu society, Kshatrias into which class Kayasthas were included according to

*Byoma Samhita*, were divided again into three sects namely *Surjabansiya* solar race, *Chandrabansiya* lunar race and *Chitragnapti*abansiya, and those of the former two sects who were physically strong, were employed for defence by military operations and those of the latter who were strong in intellectual and moral developments, were employed in literary departments of the administration of the country. The members of the former two sects were therefore called warrior class, অসিঞ্জীবী and those of latter writer class, বসীঞ্জীবী

I now give below the meaning of the word কায়স্থ *Kayastha*, as explained in the আচারনির্ণয়তন্ত্র *Acharnirnaya Tantra* ককরং ব্রাহ্মণং বিদ্যাধিকারং নিত্যসংজ্ঞকং আয়স্থ নিকটং জেয়ং তত্র কায়স্থি তিষ্ঠতি ॥ ক means Brahma আ constant য় near or close. The meaning of the word *Kayastha* therefore, is constantly near or close to Brahma.

The assertion that the five *Kayasthas* came to the court of *Adisur* along with the five *Brahmanas* as menial servants of *Sudra* class is not tenable from the fact that those five *Kayasthas* received from the king all sorts of honours and gifts equally with those *Brahmanas* and because of the injunction that any *Brahmana* having any connection with *Sudra* as stated above, shall be considered fallen and unworthy of presentation to the king whose guests they are. The introduction given will be dealt with later

on. It will no doubt be admitted on all hands that the Brahmanas of that ancient time were really men of the highest order. The Sastras such as the—*Vedas, Darsans, Samhitas, Tantras, Smritis*, the *Mahabharata, Ramayan, Gita* and other Purans support me. The authorship of those productions as alleged might be questioned but admittedly they are the productions of Brahmanas' brain. The reality of the characters described therein, may also be questioned but the sentiments, instructions, discussions deductions, arguments and moral maxims setforth in those works, irresistibly prove that their authors were undoubtedly men of superior and rare talents and moral culture. It reflects no small credit on the Kayasthas that they only could have appreciated such high attainments and merits of Brahmanas, in recognition of which they rightly paid a homage to them in their place of imigration by the acceptance of the humiliating term "Dass" They could have done well to recognise their superiority by an expression of any other humiliating phraseologies than Dass. The word Dass was prefixed by Kayasthas to their family titles in the same consideration and sense as the Brahmanas in selecting the names for their sons add the word "Dass" to their family titles, such as Hari Dass, Kally Dass, Durga Dass, Shibo Dass, Mukherjee, Bannerjee, or Chatterji meaning thereby that their children are Dasses, to those Gods or Goddesses

The use of the word "Dass" in the names of the descendants of the four out five Kayasthas accompanying the Brahmanas to the Court of Adisur can not mean to signify that Kayasthas were and are menial servants of Brahmanas in spite of the fact that Kayasthas in places other than Bengal, even the Bengal Kayasthas, such as Uttar Parah and Barendra Kayasthas, do not use the word "Dass."

The Brahmana followers or disciples of Chyatanya Deb used to affix the word "Dass" to their names simply to declare their humiliation to all beings and to express their total denial of self-consciousness with the inherent desire of obtaining the grace of *Hari* the supreme Hindu God. The word Dass itself does not convey a meaning anything like meanness, when the same word is affixed to the names of Kayasthas why it would mean to signify sudraism, or meanness though even in fact Kayasthas as a rule do not use the word Dass. Those Kayasthas who use it do not name them as Dass Bose or Mitra before men of the same পর্যায়ে *Paryaya* of succession or a lower one. Raghunandana himself who intended to divide the Hindus into Brahmanas and Sudras even prescribed that the word Dass should not be used in the matters of marriage and other religious observances. His words are quoted.

বসু-বোষাদিরূপ-পদ্ধতিযুক্ত নামতৎক বোধ্যং ।

Further evidence of Kayasthas not being Sudra is given here that when Buddhism was in its supremacy in Bengal Kayasthas preached the religious tenets and doctrines, along with Brahmanas, Sudras were never allowed to do so.

Shama Charan Sarkar, a brahmana had, in view of different Hindu Sastras, to admit in his Vyavastha Darpana, collection of authorities and usages, that "there is, therefore a preponderance of authority to evince that the Kayasthas, whether of Bengal or of any other country, were Kshatrias. But since several centuries passed, the Kayasthas at least those of Bengal ) have degenerated and degraded to Shudradom, not only by using after their proper names the surname "Dass" peculiar to the Shudras giving up their own which is Barma but principally by omitting to perform the regenerating ceremony Upanayana hallowed by the *Gayatri*" a sacred verse which is considered to be the essence of the Vedas. It is no doubt a fallacious conclusion that by simply using a word and omitting a ceremony connected with an external manifestation or demonstration, a distinct group of Hindus classified either in regard to inherent qualifications or to the relative superiority of the parts of the creating power producing the different classes, has been degenerated from their original place of assignment so as to be included into the

caste Sudra similarly classified. Again the word "Dass" is not peculiar to the Sudras, it is not at all used after their proper names. Kayasthas have not at all degraded themselves by the use of the word "Dass" on the contrary they have exhibited their greatness and high intellectual culture as explained above. By the abandonment of the sacred thread they might be called Kshatria without the thread or *Bartya* Kshatrias but never Sudras. The non-observance or observance, not quite in accordance with dictates of the Hindu Sastras, by any of the four divisions, of any essential ceremonies or any other omission, has never or ever been considered to be a bar against its admission to the class originally made. Such omission or commission by Kayasthas should not only be taken a bar against their inclusion into their assigned group but also render them to an absurd metaphysical composition. Is it not necessary for the Kayastha prior to resuming the right of undergoing the Upanayana ceremony to have this conclusion proved to be baseless and to set aside any decision if passed on this point which would be quite in opposition to the Hindu Sastras. It will appear from Kayastha Karika, books on geneology, that the ceremony was abandoned when they adopted the Budhism. It is probable that it was abandoned in the same sense as the Brahmanas forego the ceremony on adopting

the Brahma Dharma. The use of the word Dass in the names of Kayasthas by the priests when performing religious ceremonies of Kayasthas, has been the outcome of vindictive design of the Nadia Raj family founded by Bhabananda Mazumdar, whose ascendancy to power was due to the fall of Raja Pratapaditya, a Kayastha.

The introduction of Dassaratha Bose as given by the Brahmanas to Adisur is extracted below :—

বসুধাধিপচক্রবর্তিনো বসুতুল্যা বসুবংশসম্ভবাঃ ।

বসুধাবিদিতা গুণার্ণবৈঃ নিয়তং তে জয়িনো ভবন্ত নঃ ॥

দশরথো বিদিতো জগতীতলে দশরথ-প্রথিতঃ প্রথমঃকুলে ।

দশদিশাং জয়িনাং যশসা জয়ী বিজয়তে বিভবৈঃকুলসাগরে ॥

The substance of the above is that the descendants of Basu family are as sacred as the most venerable Basu (of the Hindu Pantheon) and they are paramount powers among the rulers of the country and are widely known to be the possessors of high virtues and are always glorious, Dassaratha is the first progenitor of that Basu family whose transcendental virtues overshadow all. The above description exactly agrees with that of the King Basu, a descendant of King Puru who was a Kshatria.

I would now ask all including the present class of Brahmanas to say whether it would have not been absurd to get a member of a Sudra family introduced to the Raja ly highly qualified Brahmanas in those eulogistic terms.

unless they are prepared to charge their forefathers with a serious condemnation of misrepresentation of facts which are far from truth. Before expressing opinion on this point every one should have regard to the high moral developments and strict observance of truthfulness which were then considered to be the highest virtue and should not be influenced by the action and movements of the Brahmanas of the present age. By the irresistible nature's law of rise and fall a most deplorable change has to the great misfortune of the Hindu Society taken place in all Bharat of Hindus so far as moral culture is concerned.

The descendants of those Rishi like Brahmanas have now offered instances of the most striking contrast so much so that their forefathers if they ever happen to see them, will be surely ashamed to recognise them as such. Their descendants, have interpolated the Vedas. They do not care for the injunctions laid down in the Hindu Sastras that sons of Brahmanas by right of birth can not claim to be Brahmanas, unless they qualify themselves to be Brahmanas. If they are wanting in any of the requisite qualifications they should be considered by the Brahmanas themselves as men worse than Sudra and if again a member of any of the three other groups attains the qualifications required of a Brahmana he should be recognised as a Brahmana. In ancient days, quali-

fied Kayasthas or Kshatrias and Sudras were recognised as Brahmanas, and in support of this I give two instances, Biswamitra Rishi who was a Kayastha and the son of the Rishi known as ( অন্ধ ঋষি ) Blind Rishi, who was inadvertently pierced by the arrow of Raja Dassarith. The latter himself admitted before the Raja that he was born of Vaiysa father by Sudra mother. By modern Samhitas Brahmanas however unqualified are recognised as Brahmanas and those of the other three groups however eminently qualified are not to be given even a grade higher than the one under which their forefathers were originally classified. The Brahmanas of the present age consider that their external manifestation—the thread, entitles them to claim for the same amount of homage and tributes, as were voluntarily and spontaneously paid to their ancestors in consideration of the high qualifications, attainments and devoted services for the welfare of the Hindu Societies. Therefore the dues paid to their ancestors were legal and obligatory which the present brahmanas whose movements are actuated and guided by self-interests only, cannot claim for either on the strength of moral qualifications, virtues or social services. As it is generally the case that when a man is degraded in intellectual and moral culture, in wealth and social, position, he feels pain to see others who were inferior to him improved or advanced and tries to put them down by

fair or foul means. With that object some of the brahmanas disregarding the injunction of their forefather question the fact of the Kayasthas being Kshatrias. Our ancient sages classified the Hindus under four generic groups with a proviso of degradation and promotion, to represent their vocations with reference to four organs of actions, while the Brahmanas of modern age adhere in tact to the classification and ignore totally the proviso and for that purpose modern Samhitas were edited. I quote the following passage from Cyclopaedia of India by Edward Balfour L.R.O.S.E., published in 1871. *Purushasakta* Hymn of the *Rigveda* is regarded by Sanskrit Scholars as of late introduction. But in it occurs the passage descriptive of the origin of Brahmanas, kshatrias, Vaisyas, and Sudras from larynx, arm, thigh, and foot of Brahma respectively ; according to Chevalier Bunsen Brahmanas have systematically adulterated and adjusted the early history of India. It appears therefore that the theory of four Barnas having sprung from the different parts of the body of Brahma is based on the interpolation. Raghunandana of the district of Nadia in Bengal compiled modern Samhitas actuated by a desire to practically divide the Hindus under the two classes, Brahmana and Sudra. Believing that Vaisyas were not then in existence he aimed to prove the non-existence of kshatrias by quoting the following two lines from the

“Manu” omitting the next two lines.

শনকৈস্ত ক্রিয়ালোপাদিযাঃ কত্রিয়জাতয়ঃ ।

ব্রহ্মণঃ গতালোকা ব্রাহ্মণাদর্শনেনচ ॥

He meant to apply this authority to all kshatrias in India or at least in Bengal though the meaning of the quotation is that the kshatrias of the places named, have become Sudra for want of brahmanas as they could not have been able to have their religious rites and ceremonies performed according to the dictates of the Vedas for want of Brahmanas. It is a pity that he purported to apply the above quoted authority to kshatrias of all places when the words ইমাঃকত্রিয় জাতয়ঃ were used therein meaning thereby বক্ষ্যমানা কত্রিয় জাতয়ঃ *i. e.*, those kshatrias named. He was guilty of intentional misrepresentation and this will be quite clear from the the next two lines given below :—

পৌণ্ড্রকাশৌড়্রবিভাঃ কাষোজা জবনাঃশকাঃ ।

পারদাপহবাস্টীনাঃ কিরাতা দরদাঃ খশাঃ ॥ মত্ ১০ শ্লোক ৪৪ ।

Meaning that the kshatrias of the places named Poundra, Odra, Drabir, Camboje, Jabana, Shak, Parad Pallab, Ohin, Kirat and Khash, have by and by become Sudras owing to the reasons given in the first two lines. Those kshatrias were meant by Manu and not those of all places. The want of Brahmanas was the cause of the effect. Accepting Raghunandana I would ask

how could Kshatrias specially those of Nadia where a Brahmana like Raghunandana was then living be degraded for want of Brahmana. The rational conclusion would be that there was no Brahmana in Bengal though we see so many with threads. I do not intend to make mention of the exposure made by the esteemed Sir late Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar.

The five Brahmanas and five Kayasthas who had come to the Court of Adisur returned home after performing the Yajna. The reason of their emigration in Bengal is not given here. The present Bengal is not quite identical with the ancient Bengal and to assign now its actual old position, is a question of much controversy but it is a plain fact that the Arya Kayasthas are not the aboriginies of ancient Bengal which was then considered a *patitadesh*, polluted country, so much so that any one coming into or passing through it on any other mission than pilgrimage, was required to undergo *praschitra*—payment of fines, before he had been admitted into his own caste otherwise he should be degraded. The aboriginal inhabitants were Kole Let, Bagdi, Ambrashta, Karana (Kayet), Septasati Brahmana and others.

It has been sufficiently shown that the Arya Kayasthas are Kashatras either having descended from Chitra Gupta or from the widow of Kashatria Rajah Chandra Sen who was killed by Parusaram while the Queen was carrying a

child as stated in the Skunda Purana, or from the fact that the creator of the universe having gifted them with such moral and intellectual propensities as had justified the Rishis to classify the possessors of those qualifications under the group Kshatria. Taking an impartial view of the different Hindu Sastras and considering the high intellectual and moral qualifications and the social status of the Kayasthas, occupied by them since the early constitution of the Hindu Societies it would be highly unfair and imprudent on the part of any one to suppose that Kayasthas are Sudras. It needs no demonstration that none of the specific caste belonging to any of the four divisions has excelled the Kayasthas in intellectual qualifications and social position, though in the present day the kind and liberal ruler of the country has been giving the same education equally to all their subjects. The modern theory that the Kayasthas are functional group developed within the lower grades of the Arya community in response to the demand for official and literary class, can not be maintained in the face of the fact that this official and literary class was allowed to study the Vedas which no other than Dvija had a right to read in that early stage of the Hindu Society. Besides the demand for this responsible and important officials and the high literary attainments of the kind, could not have been met from the lower order of men whose duties were at that time

assigned to simply serve the men of the twice born groups.

That the Arya Kayasthas were warlike men and men of position could not be questioned in as much as the kings of Gour Bhanya dynasty and Paul family who were Kayasthas, were the rulers of the country for a period of 1234 years. The admission of a particular Unarya Kayastha into a Arya Kayastha family is very rare. An isolated instance does not at all affect the community itself but the family connecting with the interloper, thus the admission of non-brahmana followers of Chaityna Deb calling themselves Goswami, and Adhikari, Brahmanas is not taken as a degrading factor of the Brahmana Community. A true brahmana does not even now a days take the rice of so called brahmana, Similary a Kayastha never takes the rice of Karana Kayets. These Kayets are mostly found in Orissa Ohittagong Tippera and in the United provinces of Agra and Oudh and they generally follow unskilful professions and serve as mineal servants of Kayasthas and Brahmanas. 23,671

A writer in the Banga Darsana of the month of *Sraban* 1280, expressed his opinion taking Karana as synonym of Kayastha and that the word Das, affixed to the names of some of the Kayasthas as conveying the meaning of Sudraism. He does not know even that উশাশা সংহিতা *Ushanasha Samhita* and উশাশা ধর্মপুস্তক, *Ushanasha* religious books, are two distinct works which have been declared by

our Rishis not to be at all an authority. The conclusion of the writer would appear to be baseless in view of the injunctions of the Hindu Sastras quoted in these pages. Kayasthas in Behar, the United provinces, Bombay, Madras and even in some parts of Bengal still observe the Upanyana ceremony. The abandonment of that ceremony must necessarily be the effect of subsequent action of some of the Bengal Kayasthas, who were originally of the Arya kayastha community. My contention is that the Bengal Kayasthas are by birth Kshatrias, owing to reasons given their ancestors gave up the thread ; if they now want to resume the right they may do so if permitted by Hindu Sāstras, and if any real advantage is gained. Certain relevant questions arise regarding this right of resumption, though it is a fact that only those brahmanas who are ignorant of the Hindu Sastras and who do not know even the cause of the assignment of the brahmanas under 36 grades *male* and of the phraseologies *নাধা*, *nadha*, *ধন্ডা*, *dhanda*, *বারুইহাটী* *baruihati*, *মুলুকজুরী* *mulukjuri* and who have gained their knowledge of the Sastras from *jatra*, and theatrical parties and from the preachings of professional *Kathak*, *oracular* tripod, are the foremost to disregard the fact of the Kayasthas being Kshatrias, whether the present method adopted in resuming the right of taking the sacred thread after undergoing the *Praschitra* in a summary way is justifiable, when the time of

the observance of taking the thread is fixed in the Manu as follows :—

গর্ভাষ্টমেষুর্কুর্বাতি ব্রাহ্মণ সোপনায়ণঃ ।

গর্ভাদেকাদশে রাজ্ঞো গর্ভতু দ্বাদশে বিশঃ ॥ ২ অ ৩৬ শ্লোক

It enjoins that the Upanyana ceremony is to be observed in the case of a Brahmana within eight years from the date of conception, a Kshatria within eleven and a Vaisya within 12. The above is the general rule, there are special rules limiting a shorter time. The time has however been extended to 16 years to Brahmana, 20 to Kshatria and 24 years to Vaisya. How could then Kayasthas, lapse Kshatrias, after retirement from service under 55 years rules, how could a man who has to his credit only a few days to undergo the troubles of this world, and how could a man who has passed the time limits, resume the right of taking the thread abandoned some centuries ago and again how could a father without the thread have his son ornamented or equipped with the thread himself being barred by limitation of time. Is not this a sham demonstration without the commensurate result ? Does it not indicate a desire to regain the right which their forefathers had abandoned ? To all matters involving judicial, executive, and revenue considerations and judgments, the rules of limitation apply. In social matter also Hindu Sastras have laid down limitation rules but it now

seems that those rules might be ignored and disregarded by payment of fines to brahmanas in any convenient way. Hindu Sastras provides prayashchitta—expiatory ceremony for the commission and omission, either knowingly or unknowingly of anything prohibited or allowed. To expiate for the offence, a brahmana qualified according to the Hindu Sastras is first of all required. The duties of brahmanas are prescribed to be peace, self-restrain, zeal, purity, patience, rectitude, wisdom, learning and theology. Again the prayashchitta ceremony should be performed in strict observance of the rules laid down for exonerating oneself from being a lapse Kshatria. The Karana Kayasthas in the United provinces of Agra and Oudh are called *Karnama* and are regarded as Sudra, though they put on the sacred threads, therefore the thread itself has no intrinsic value to make a man brahmana, kshatria or vaisya. The thread is to be sanctified according to the dictates of the Hindu Sastras and the holder of it must have the requisite qualifications of those three groups. If the taking of the thread is considered essential, let there be a general assemblage of Pundits from different parts of India and of the Arya Kayasthas, in which the question is to be discussed in all its phases and if it is decided in the affirmative, take the thread by all means, otherwise there should not be a revolutionary movement bringing about disastrous effect in the Kayastha community. Any one relying on the

interpolation in the Rig Veda must take that all the brahmanas under the sub-divisions of Sarawata, Kanyakubga, Utkal, Maithila, Maharashtra, Andra, Dravira, Carnata and Guzrat, were originally on the one and the same level of sacerdotal or brahmanical population, their ancestors having sprung from the mouth of Brahma. Their divisions into different grades, high or low, are therefore human assignments. Each of these is for all purposes a distinct sect of brahmanas. Interchange of rice taking, matrimonial and any other connections between them are not permissible. No member of any of the divisions does take the rice or dishes prepared by the Bengal brahmanas who are again divided into sects as Paschatya Vaidika, Radhiya, Barendra. Dakshintya Vaidika and Madhyasreni, Matrimonial connection between them is also not admissible. In spite of all these provincial differences all the members of the different places are of the same stock or origin. Similarly all the Kayasthas in Bengal, Bihar, United provinces of Agra and Oudh, Bombay, Madras, Central provinces and Guzrat known by different sectional names, are of the same stock having sprung from the same part of the body of Brahma, It would therefore be highly imprudent on the part of any one believing the so-called accounts of the origin of the Hindus, to question the fact that the Bengal Kayasthas who are the descendants of the immigrants from

Upper India and who are called Dakshin Rarhi, Uttar Rarhi, Bangaja and Barendra Kayasthas, after the names of the countries of settlement, are Kshatrias when their kinsmen known by different names in other provinces in India, are admitted to be Kshatrias. The grading of brahmanas and kayasthas was not made by brahmanas but by the ruler of Bengal, Ballalsen a Brahma Kshatria *i. e.* Kayastha.

The worthy ancestors of the Bengal brahmanas officiated at the religious ceremonies performed by Adisur the great great-grandfather of Ballalsen, were certainly higher order of Brahmanas, their progenies would be of their order. Ballalsen classified brahmanas and Kayasthas into Kulin and maulik having special regard to the qualifications of each individual member of the community. Dr. J. N. Bhattacharya has stated in his book on "the Hindu castes and sects," that higher classes of brahmanas do not perform the religious ceremonies of Kayasthas. That statement has therefore no foundation in fact, unless he has meant Kulin brahmanas only but he could not have even meant that, because Kulin brahmanas very scarcely officiate as priests for Brahmanas or Kayasthas, they do not carry the profession of priests neither do they generally study the Hindu Sastras, I find many statements in Dr. Bhattacharya's book, which, are not based on Sastric or customary authorities. I give some instances

touching the Kayasthas only, to quote similar instances regarding other castes would be out of place.

1. The majority of Kayasthas do admit their status as Sudra. No Arya Kayasthas admit this, no authority is quoted. As many brahmanas do not know the cause of grading them into 36 *mela*, grades, similarly many Kayasthas do not know that all Ghose, Bose, and Mitra families are not Kulin. Their admission if any has been made should not have been used.
2. The brahmanas excluded the Kayasthas from the study of Sanscrit language and literature. This is quite baseless, when accountants, treasurers, assessors, and members in the Court of Justice, who were all Kayasthas were enjoined to study Smritis and other books in Sanscrit as has already been shown in previous pages.
3. The five Kayasthas who came in company of the five brahmanas to the Court of Adisur, were menial servants of those brahmanas. No authority quoted nor explanation offered. The absurdity of such assertion has already been proved from Hindu Sastras.
- 4 Division of Dakshina Rarhi Kayasthas into 3 groups. Kulin, Maulik and seventy-two houses. This is not the case and is not supported by Karikas, books on geneology or from any records. This is inconsistent on his own statement. He gives family titles of 19 houses only, and not of the remaining 53 houses. He admits that Dakshina Rarhi are the descendants of five

Kayasthas. How could have the progenies of five families, Ghose, Bose, Mitra, Guha and Dutta split up into seventy two families of different family titles ? Accounts of the origin of those families are quite different, no Dakhina Rarhi, Uttar Rarhi or Bangaj Kayasthas do contract matrimonial connection with those families, though isolated instances of such connection at the present day may be given. 5. Kayasthas can give their daughter in marriage to Kulin or Maulik, no restriction. This is not correct, Kulin might give his daughter to Kulin or Maulik but not in all cases, but Maulik cannot marry his daughter to another Maulik. If he does he is looked down. I know of a Maulik being ex-communicated having married his daughter to another Maulik. 6. Uttar Rarhi Ghose or Sinha is not necessarily Kulin. Does Dr. Bhattacharya mean that all Dakhina Rarhi Ghose and Mitra are Kulin. He should know that such is not the case. I do not wish to increase these pages by referring to other instances of inaccuracies which are abundantly found in his book.

Another thing which I must bring to notice that in the English translation of the *Manu Samhita* by Sir William Jones the word *Karan* has been qualified by the words or "Kayasthas" though such amplification is not in the original nor in its commentary by Kulluka Batta and others. This impropriety was not noticed and therefore not

corrected because the Samhita was all along in manuscript which could not have been available nor does the translation could be had in one out of ten thousand Hindu families ; therefore the mistake was not hitherto pointed out and I find the same mistaken authority has been repeated by others who wrote about the cast distinction.

In view of the authorities cited in these pages, no body could reasonably be able to ignore the fact that the Kayasthas were originally Kshatrias, but he may enquire what they are now at the present age. In answer to this it may well be pointed out at once that such a question would be irrelevant and exotic having regard to the general violation of the injunctions laid down in the Hindu sastras for the guidance of all the Hindus of the four Barnas. Certainly the Bengal Kayasthas do not observe the Upanayana ceremony and for that they have become *bartyas*, lapse Kshatrias, but such *bartyas* can be found many among the brahmanas and Vaisyas. The simple fact of putting the thread on the shoulder and carrying it as a mark of *Dijwa*, is not sufficient to exclude the carrier of the thread from being *bartya*. The thread even is not prepared as enjoined. No body can say that Kayasthas do not follow the callings and profession assigned to them by ancient sages. They were *সমীক্ষিক* writer class and they are still the same writer class and their in-

tellectual development is rather on the advance. Regarding moral culture the ideas are in the present age quite different. In ancient times, truthfulness and honesty were considered the best virtues and on that maxim all transactions were conducted either monetary and any other. No human witness was considered necessary neither execution of deeds even was considered obligatory. If deeds were at all written in the place witness the words Dharma Narayan, moon, sun, and such like names were written. In the present day the bonafide of the transaction and execution of the deed with respectable witnesses is questioned with the object of shirking the obligation and liabilities. Everybody will admit that the non-observance of the injunction of the Hindu Sastras does not now a days disqualify the Hindus to claim their assigned position. It is an admitted fact that Kayasthas stand in the Hindu Society next to the brahmanas and it can be confidently asserted that no other caste has even qualified itself to intervene between the two though much improvement has been attained by some castes occupying places next to the Kayasthas.

● In Judicial courts questions were incidentally or directly raised whether Kayasthas were Kshatrias or not, it was held by some court that Kayasthas were Kshatrias and by some that they had rendered themselves Sudras ; perhaps the last decision was based on the conclusion of late Shama

Charan Sarkar. which has already been proved to be fallacious. In such matters the decision of the courts are based on the authority of the Hindu Sastras. Why should we then trouble the Court ? The Hindus have their sastras, the authorities should be fairly discussed by the Hindu community in case of any doubt. Such isolated decision may not be taken to be our conclusive and final guide, more specially when we find the decision passed after due and proper enquiries and sufficient consideration by the first court, is revised or set aside by the second higher court and again the decision of the second Court is not upheld by the next higher Court but that of the first Court is confirmed. When such is the case it would be well if such social matters are discussed and settled by the society itself. Our ancient sages formulated and constituted the Hindu Society having regard to the prevailing tendencies and movement of the time. The injunctions laid down in the Manu Samhita were just opportune for the time when it was propounded. They have been modified to some extent and revised by subsequent sages with reference to the changes of time. Now considering the changes occurring in almost all matters touching the Hindu Society and rules of Manu not being followed and adhered to customs, usages, professions, callings and other social transactions have all

been changed by the influence of time and virtue of foreign civilisation ; practically the injunctions in the different Hindu Sastras are disregarded and new injunctions given though such injunctions have not been compiled in the forms of Samhitas. Would it not be desirable and advantageous to have new Samhitas compiled by our present sages to adapt to the present time ? Almost everything which was prohibited in our Sastras, is now being followed, and the Hindu societies formerly constituted are no more in existence. Change there must be by nature's law of rise and fall, and we have been practically disregarding the rules framed by our sages of yore. Why then so much controversy and dispute about the Hindu societies which are not really in existence ? Such a state of thing will certainly be more productive of mischief than good, it will simply bring about division amongst ourselves, which was and is always the main factor for degradation and ruin. Caste distinctions were originally made as stated in the *Gita* for division of actions and duties. Division of labour is always beneficial ; therefore the classification of the Hindus must be adhered to for good, but the proviso made in those Sastras should also be observed. Following the law of division of labour a man who is at first required to do unskilled labour, subsequently qualifying himself for skilled labour is, as a rule, promoted from his

position of original assignment. Similarly a member of any of the four classified groups when disqualified, should be degraded and when qualified should be promoted as laid down in the Sastras already explained above. It must be admitted that Kayasthas were classed by our Rishis under the group "Kshatria" and this has also been decided by some Judicial Courts. By the non-observance of *Upanayna* ceremony the Bengal Kayasthas have become *bartyas*. If there is any real advantage in carrying the thread and if the Kayasthas want to have it, no body can object to this, provided it is taken as directed in the Hindu Sastras but not in the way now being adopted by some Kayasthas. Such a novel move will no doubt cause new boundary lines in the scope of the Kayastha community. Such a division is not at all desirable in these days of partition.

I give below the substance of a decision of a Judicial Court in which it is held that Kayasthas are Kshatrias.

Dewani Adalat district Mirzapur. Partition suit, Plaintiff-Hurakh and Joimangal, Defendant Subidha and Alopa.

In this suit the plaintiff who was an illegitimate son of one Shivacharan, a Kayastha, claimed according to Hindu law an equal share with the defendant, the legitimate son of the same Shivacharan, on the ground that Shivacharn was Sudra being a Kayastha. Both parties

were sufficiently represented and in conformity with the ruling of the 16th May 1878 the Court gave full time to argue the points of Hindu law as regards the claim.

The plaintiff put in the following documentary evidence.

Statement of Kumar Luchman Sing, District Collector Bulandshahar. Writings of the former Mirzapur Judge, Mr. Colebrook, and Elphinstone History of India.

The witnesses examined were Pundit Ramdhan Tiwari, who deposed that Kayasthas are Kshatrias according to Shukra Smriti and that they are said to be Mahishya by some and Sudra by others, Beturam said that illegitimate sons of Brahmanas do inherit property and that in answer to an enquiry by some Bengal Kayasthas, he gave a Vyavastha prescribing 30 days to be their mourning period and therefore they were considered as Sudras. The customs of the Kayasthas in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh were not examined by him.

The documentary evidence put in by the Defendant are enumerated below :—Virmitradaya, extracts from Brihaspati and Vyasa's decisions, Jagnavalkya smriti and Mitakshara, extracts from the Bhavishya, Skanda, Padma, Matshya, and Garur Purans; Brihat Parashar Smriti, Vishnu Dharma Sutra, Ahulya Kamdhenu, Vyavahar-mayukha, Yajurveda Shatapatha Brahmana, Vyavastha-directions, from Pundits

of Kashmir, Mathura, Benares, Oudh, Bengal, *Paschim* (west) and Jambu, as also from the Pundits of Sadar Dewani Adalat of Agra, English Kayastha Ethnology by Munshi Kaliprosad, pleader, Rai Bahadur, M. Brojobhusanlal, Registrar, Judicial Department, Oudh, Babus Sriram M.A., B.L., Government pleader, Ramsaran Das, M.A., Member Asiatic Society, and Haragovind Doyal, M.A. ; copies of the decisions of the Sub-judges, Gazipur, and Allahabad, copy of document of customary laws of the Brahmanas, Kshatrias, and Kayasthas of Protapghar signed by Pundit Janakiprosad, extra assistant Commissioner and copy of the decision of the assistant Commissioner, Bara Banki. The witnesses examined were Pundit Nityananda who was deputed by Babu Raghunathprosad Rao of Benares and who supplied a copy of the Ahulya Kamdhenu, and showed the original passage which he quoted in his examination in-chief and gave his opinion that Kayasthas were Kshatrias, not Sudras. Pundit Vastiram Dobey, teacher of grammar Government Sanskrit College, Benares and an old Brahmana of the highest authority in Benares, showed the original authorities from texts and proved that Chitrogupta and Chandraseni Kayasthas were Kshatrias, Pundit Dhundiraj Sastri, pupil of the teacher of Dharma-sastra in the Sanskrit College, Benares, explained the Vyavastha of the Pundits of Benares and said that

the Rajaram Sastri, who was professor of Dharma Sastra in the Benares College had left notes in his handwriting showing that Kayasthas are Kshatrias. He also said that the Chitrageupta and Chandraseni Kayasthas were Kshatrias. Barna. Pundit Gajadhar Prosad Bhatta of Kadi, Allahabad, Raja Vajirchand Talukdar, Munshi Rambax, Ramratanlal Kanungo, Jaunpur, Rai Baldev Box Bahadur, Raniprasad Tahasildar, Munshi Bhairav Prosad an old pleader of the High Court, Allahabad, and other 23 very respectable witness, Government officials and private gentlemen, were examined on commission. On the evidence adduced and recorded the Sub-judge dismissed the case on the 17th August, 1877, holding that Kayasthas were Kshatrias.

In the Vyavastha Darpan of Shamacharn Sarkar it is shown that there is preponderance of evidence in the Hindu Sastras that Kayasthas are Kshatrias and the records of the Judicial Court also show that Kayasthas are Kshatrias. This is based on the opinion of distinguished and learned Pundits who should be called as Rishis of the present age. In face of all these if anyone questions the real fact, he will simply expose his want of knowledge in the Hindu Sastras or at least his penal motive for which, if Manu's rules were in force, he would have been deprived of his tongue, and other organs.

The interpolation in the Rig Veda that Brahmanas, has proceeded from the mouth, Kshatrias from the arms, Vaisya from

the thigh and Sudra from the feet of Brahma, does not mean what is interpreted by the brahmanas of the present age. Such an interpretation is absurd and also confines that infinite, eternal, all-powerful, omnipotent and omniscient God, the first cause of the universe, to a limit of human form attaching different kinds of importance and sanctity to the different parts of that form or body. That indefinite, invisible God, the creator, the Designer, the First Cause and the father or mother of the universe, may be described according to one's own idea and may be called by any name but He is the creator of all things and beings. The Hindus call that power by the name of Brahma, the other nations call that power by some other names such as Allah, Jehovah Elohim, Apollo, Jessuspiter, or Jupiter and others but all these names refer to the one and the same all powerful, omnipotent and omniscient Being ; therefore the Brahma of the Hindus is the creator of the universe. If the population of India, have been created as interpreted, then it follows that the populations of each of the different countries of the world must have been created differently and at different times and that the different parts of his body have different grades of sanctity and importance ; such an idea can only be conceived by a non-Hindu and by the non-believer of that Power. The assertion in the Gita is admissible and acceptable being cor-

rect. I repeat what is said in that Dharma Sastras. চারুর্ধ্বঃ  
 স্নায়ুঃ ষণ্ণো কর্মবিভাগশ্চ। That is the Hindus were divided  
 into four Barnas according to their propensities, qualifica-  
 tions, and intellectual culture with the object of assigning  
 to each its pursuits and acts. For illustrative purpose  
 the Hindus shaped that all powerful Being in hu-  
 man form according to their own liking and conception  
 and formulated themselves into four groups referring  
 to four organs of action with a view to indicate the  
 pursuits, which each group is to follow. Therefore  
 the explanation given by the Brahmanas of the  
 interpolation is by all means irrational. At the time  
 when those injunctions were first issued and Samhitas and  
 Vedas were compiled Hindusthan, was the land of Hindus  
 and the Brahmanas whose moral and intellectual culture  
 reached the highest pinnacle in the civilised world about  
 2000 years B.O. were their leaders, legislators, King-makers,  
 and spiritual guides; now the country has become the home  
 of many nations of different castes and creeds and the  
 Brahmanas have degraded themselves both morally and  
 intellectually. Necessarily changes for the worse have taken  
 place. It would unquestionably be an act of prudence on  
 the part of the Hindus to have those injunctions and  
 Samhitas revised and remodelled by competent authorities  
 with reference to the actual changes of time though it is

a fact that our ancient lawgivers made certain provisions in their laws in view of prospective changes. It would be simply ridiculous to make reference to the provisions in those laws which in fact were repealed by our own actions and movements and to express a desire to bring them again into operation while practically they have become inoperative by influence of time and by our present actions and movements. The question has become so important and grave that its solution will not grow easier being postponed further. I conclude with one word more that when the classification of Hindus of different grades of the same class was regarded and observed, no Maulik could venture to dictate any terms whatever in the marriage of his son with a daughter of a Kulin. The Maulik should and would consider the match a fortunate one and have it gladly contracted paying an honorarium to the Kulin, now a days a Maulika's demand in such a case becomes prohibitive of the marriage. For such an act, the Maulik is not looked down in any community of the Hindus, neither the Kulin is anxious to possess the requisite qualifications. Any step for the prevention of such a demand would do more good to the society than any resulting from the demonstration of brotherly sympathy on the anniversary day of partition and from the resumption of right of *Upanayan* ceremony.

I have already referred to some of the grave misstatements and fallacious conclusion made by Dr. J. N. Bhattacharjea in his "Hindu Caste and sects" and by Babu Shamacharan Sarkar in his "Vyavastha Durpana." I have also tried to show that Karanas are not Kayasthas. This error is possibly perpetuated by Sir W. Jones. He translated the 6th stanza of the 10th chapter of the Manu Samhita as "Sons begotten by twice-born men on women of the class next immediately below them, wise legislators call similar, *not the same*, in class *with their parents*, because they are degraded, *to a middle rank between both*, by the lowness of their mothers : *they are named in order Murdhabhishieta, Mahishya, and Carana or Cayastha, &c.*" In the Preface, he, however, explains : The *Pandits* care so little for genuine ehroulogy, that none of them can tell me the age of Culluca, whom they always name with applause ; but he informs us himself, that he was a Brahmen of Varendra tribe, whose family had been long settled in Gour or Bengal, but that he had chosen his residence among the learned on the banks of the holy rivers at *Cosi* : His text and interpretation I have almost implicitly followed, though I had myself collected many copies of Manu, and among them a manuscript of very ancient date : his gloss is here printed in *Italicks* ; any reader, who may choose to pass it over is if unprinted, will have in *Roman*

letters an exact version of the original, and may form some idea of its character and structure, as well as of the *Sanscrit* idiom, which must necessarily be preserved in the verbal translation, and a translation not scrupulously verbal would have been highly improper in a work on so delicate and momentous a subject as private and criminal jurisprudence." "Graves Chamney Haughton in his edition of Sir William Jones, reads the above explanation of the words in the *Italics*; thus "The learned translator intended as he has stated in his Preface to mark by *Italick* letters all that he had borrowed from the commentators on Manu, and to print the text of his author in *Roman* letters &c."

The readers will see that the word *Karana* as a caste does not appear in the text of Manu.—The stanza is quoted for easy reference :

দ্বীধনস্তর জাতাসু দ্বিজৈকংপাদিতান সূতান্ ।

সদৃশানৈব তানাহ্মাতৃদোষবিগর্হিতান্ ॥

To determine the specific immediate castes which are not specified by Manu, Jagnavalka named them to be *Mudhaba-shicta*, *Mahisya* and *Karana*, respectively and Kulluk Bhatta referred to those castes in his commentary on the authority of Jagnavalka. Thus we get *Karana* from Jagnavalka and the castes *Karana* and *Kayastha* are the one and same from Sir William Jones. According to Manu's commentators we

get *Karana* as standing higher in caste than his mother who is a Sudra. The commentators say that the offsprings of the union mentioned are of a lower rank than the fathers and higher than the mothers. As *সদৃশানেষ* is explained *পিতৃসদৃশান্ নতু পিতৃসজাতীয়ান্* similar, not the same in caste with father; *পিতৃসদৃশগ্রহণান্নাতু জাতেঋকৃষ্টাঃ পিতৃজাতিতো নিকৃষ্টা জেয়াঃ* being similar with father, the offsprings should be higher in caste than mother and lower than father. Thus they would be occupying a middle rank between the two, not *degraded to a middle rank between both*. *Mudhabashicta*, *Mahisya* and *Karana* though not in the text of Manu, are printed in Roman letters instead of in Italics. It has been shown at the outset of the book from an old authoritative Sanskrit Dictionary that *Karana* is not synonym for *Kayastha*. In the *Manu Samhita* the word *Kayastha* does not appear as it refers to a specific caste which is comprised within the major caste head *Kshatria*, like many other specific castes which are included under the other three group heads.

*Mudhabashicta*, *Mahisya* and *Karana* are three intermediate classes mentioned, are admittedly mixed ones, never Sudra which is itself a pure caste or *Barna* proceeding from the feet of Brahma, therefore the caste *Karana* can never be Sudra but is higher than Sudra;

consequently the amplification of *Karana* made by Sir William James, does not and can not help the least in making the allegation that Kayasthas are Sudra.

THE END.











